DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 758 RC 018 617

AUTHOR Brescia, William
TITLE Funding and Resources for American Indian and Alaska Native Education.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC. Indian Nations At Risk Task Force.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 26p.; In: Indian Nations At Risk Task Force Commissioned Papers. See RC 018 612. Contains the title of a section yet to be developed.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Alaska Natives; *American Indian Education; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; Federal Indian Relationship; *Financial Support; Higher Education; Treaties
IDENTIFIERS *Bureau of Indian Affairs; Department of Education

ABSTRACT

The Federal Government has a responsibility to fulfill treaty promises for Native education. However, spending for Native education has fallen since 1975, while overall educational spending has increased. Reversal of this trend must include a shift in focus from quantitative goals to qualitative goals and support of culturally relevant education. The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and the Office of Indian Education (OIE) are the major sources of funding for Native education. However, the BIA funding formula fails to consider non-federal funding available to public schools, the effects of remote location and sparse population, and unique transportation requirements in rural areas. In addition, BIA funds are often not available until well into the school year. BIA programs for school operations cover Indian School Equalization Program formula and adjustments; institutionalized handicapped; school board expenses and training; student transportation; solo parent program; technical support; and drug and alcohol education. The BIA also administers the Johnson-O'Malley program of contracts with states; funding for higher education scholarships, postsecondary schools, and tribally controlled community colleges; and tribal operations of tribal colleges and adult education. Funding from the U.S. Department of Education covers the OIE and numerous educational programs open to all eligible students. Private foundations donate less than 1% of their monies to Native education. Native communities have a meager tax base for education funding. The equivalent of a Marshall Plan is needed to support Native self-determination in education, rebuild each Native community's infrastructure, and restructure the entire Native educational delivery system. This paper contains 33 references and lists over 100 treaties with educational provisions. (SV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED343758

FUNDING AND RESOURCES FOR AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE EDUCATION

William Brescia

RC 018617

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Funding and Resources for American Indian and Alaska Native Education

William Brescia

The Need for This Paper

High-quality education requires adequate funding. Native children are not receiving adequate educational support. It is not reasonable to expect that they will succeed in their education under current conditions. This is not an effort in which simply throwing more money at the problem will work. Native community members need to participate in the decisions about how that money is used. This means more than setting up parent advisory committees. Native parents, community leaders, educators, and officials need to be on governing boards with fiduciary responsibility. Without board control of the funds, there will once again be no guarantee that the monies will be spent for Native students. The education agenda "must be set and controlled by Indian people" (INAR Third Business Meeting, Hill, 1990, p. 12).

Improvement of Native schools should be considered part of the national school restructuring strategy and should conform to the goals jointly agreed upon by the president and the governors. The following goals should be met by the year 2000:

1. Every child will start school ready to learn.
2. The graduation rate will increase to 90 percent nationally.
3. All students will master the basic subject areas at all grade levels.
4. Our country will be preeminent in math and science.
5. All adults will be literate.
6. All schools will be free of drugs and provide an environment that is safe for learning. (INAR, Cavazos, 1990, p. 3)

Because of the small numbers of Native students, the sums of money necessary to do an excellent job will not strain the budget. There are, after all, fewer than 200 schools and dormitories funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Many of these buildings are in need of a complete overhaul or new construction; but even with a total rebuilding campaign, the entire amount required would be small compared to the national budget for education. The BIA should consider turning away from *minimum* standards for instruction and fund *excellence*. Native students in public schools, who are served by Johnson-O'Malley and the Office of Indian Education in the Education Department, constitute a small percentage of the total student population nation wide (see Chart 1 for a view of the number of Native students in school K-12). They could be served in excellent programs that the federal government could point to as an example of how education can work. With a meaningful investment in Native education, conditions could be completely reversed, so that many would succeed rather than a few.

Education data from table 10 show that Indian education spending appears to have been growing from FY-1975 to FY-1991. The annual change for BIA education, for instance, shows an increase of $2.6 million (change ratio of 1.00 percent) per year. These figures, however, are in current-dollars. Inflation has not been taken into account. The constant-dollar figures in table 11 do take inflation into account. These data show that BIA education has actually fallen by $11.8 million (-4.21 percent) a year during the period FY1975-1991. This pattern--an apparent current-dollar increase belied by a constant-dollars decline--is repeated in most Indian-related budget areas.

Table 11 shows that the Department of Education budget has averaged $15.2 billion in constant 1982 dollars during FY1975-1991 and has grown at a rate of $1932.2 million (1.27 percent) a year, but with substantial annual variation (r^2 of .332). In contrast, Office of Indian Education programs in the Department of Education have averaged $70.4 million a year in constant dollars in the same time period and have fallen $2.4 million (-3.44 percent) a year. The r^2 figures for BIA education (.898) and Indian education programs (.713) show that both have fallen consistently over the time period.

Table 12 compares budget trends in constant dollars during the years of the Reagan--Bush administrations (FY1982-1991). The Department of Education has averaged $15.5 billion with an increase of $345.7 million (2.23 percent) a year. BIA education, on the other hand, has declined $6.5 million (-2.75 percent) a year, and Indian education in the Education Department has fallen $2 million

Rc 018617

(3.36 percent) a year. All these trends are about equally consistent. (Walke, 1990, pp. 3-4)

Looking at School Finance with New Eyes

I hope that this paper will become part of a new generation of educational finance research that will redesign and reorient the field. Educational finance can no longer look only at where the money is coming from. In the future it needs to consider:

- studying student learning outcomes and how finance systems, structures, and fiscal management strategies can support more powerful interventions for improving program quality and student learning;
- emphasizing college/university attainment and completion for Native students, beyond simple access to postsecondary education;
- refocusing K-12 analyses on student outcomes and educational processes, and comparisons to what works rather than comparisons of just more or less (Picus, 1990, p. 2);
- using qualitative methods rather than relying predominantly on number crunching and quantitative methods.

Diverse Cultural Context and Construction of Meaning

Cognitive scientists have shown us that each student constructs his or her own meaning from the learning experience. Each student, regardless of race or cultural background, comes to the learning experience with a unique set of experiences and must use that background as the basis for any new understandings. No standardized curriculum can reasonably be expected to meet the needs of even a small group of students (Duffy & Knuth, 1989, p. 16; Brown 1989 pp. 3-6). Native culture, is diverse encompassing numerous languages, customs, and ways of life, Native students cannot be expected to perform well in a curriculum that reflects little or none of their culture.

An additional concern with regard to the construction of meaning involves written languages versus oral languages. Many Native students come from cultures in which oral language is preeminent. The telling of stories and the construction of reality are based on oral tradition. Mainstream culture, in contrast, is based on written language. I believe that this difference alone has a profound effect on how Native students construct meaning in the world and at school. How can we expect Native students to learn effectively if they are constructing knowledge differently than their teachers, their text books, and any media they come in contact with in schools? Native students are literally looking at a different world than most of the people they interact with at school. Until we recognize this difference and devise school finance schemes that account for it, any improvements in outcomes will be insignificant.

All of this does not even deal with the public schools' attempts to channel Native students into the mainstream culture. These coercive efforts to subvert Native culture result in:

- the classroom becoming a battleground;
- schools denying or denigrating cultural differences;
- schools blaming their own failures on the Native students and reinforcing the students' defensiveness in what should be a learning environment;
- Native communities treating schools as alien institutions;
- records of absenteeism, dropouts, negative self-image, and low achievement; and, most important,
- perpetuation of the cycle of poverty which undermines the success of all federal programs (Price & Clinton, 1983, pp. 256-257).

Diverse Social and Economic Realities

To be developed.

Why Fund Native Education?

Treaty Making and Native Education

Since the arrival of Europeans, Natives have been pressured to acculturate to Western civilization. From its beginning, the United States government has promised to protect, care for, and educate the members of the various tribes within its borders. Treaties were the official method of negotiation with Native governments, treaties representing the United States' verbal and written promises (Deloria, n.d., p. 13). The first Native treaty signed by the United States was with the Delawares in 1778 (Costo and Henry, 1977, p. 7). In 1871, however, Congress decided that Natives were wards of the government; it ended the practice of treaty making with an amendment to the

Indian Appropriations Act in that year (ibid., p. 11).

During the treaty-making period, many treaties contained an education clause. Public pressure demanded that Natives should be either civilized or destroyed. The inclusion of educational requirements in treaties fulfilled the humanitarians' obligation to civilize the Natives and establish a friendly relationship with them. To nineteenth--century humanitarians, education and civilization were synonymous (Deloria, n.d., p. 122). In the treaties, education fell into several areas, including agricultural, mechanical, and academic skills. Today these education clauses are interpreted differently both by the various tribes and by the judicial system. Because treaties and specifically the education clauses are open to various interpretations, each must be treated as a unique case (ibid., p. 41).

Treaties have played an important part in the history of Native education. The first treaty to deal specifically with education was concluded with the Oneida, Tuscarora, and Stockbridge Indians on December 2, 1794. It stipulated the training of Natives in the skills necessary to work in sawmills and gristmills (Fischbacher, 1967, p. 50). In 1873, a dispute between the Ottawa tribe and a private religious agency over fulfilling the education requirements of the treaty underscored Congress' ability to legally enforce the provisions stipulated (Deloria, n.d., p. 23).

Many of the treaties prior to 1800 promised Natives a general form of education. After 1800, the form of education, the amount of funding, and the time specifications were set forth. Many of the treaties were never fulfilled completely or satisfactorily. In other cases, treaties with definite time limits were never acted upon and "cannot be said to have lapsed without further investigation into the nature and extent of the services rendered" (ibid., pp. 40-41).

Through the years, treaties have directly and indirectly affected the legislation of education. The Civilization Act of 1819, Johnson-O'Malley Act (JOM), Wheeler-Howard Act, P.L. 81-815, and P.L. 81-874 are some of the educational products of Native treaties. Today, the difference between gratuitous services on the part of the government and fulfillment of the treaty stipulations has disappeared. "In reality all programs became part of a larger effort to fulfill legal obligations" (ibid., p. 26). [For a list of some of the treaties concerning Native education see Table A.]

Treaties were tailored to particular tribes; therefore, the education promises were also bound to individual tribes (Fischbacher, 1967, p. 51). For example, while the United States was engaged in military activities on the Plains, education provisions were made to those "nomadic tribes" eligible under treaty. As the government tried to define its responsibilities to Natives, it opened its education policy to "all children of school age without reference to race" (Deloria, n.d., p. 26). In the act of March 3, 1819, "all tribes whether they held any treaty relations with the United States or not" were able to reap the benefits of education as stipulated in treaties (ibid.,p. 12).

In addition to tribes, treaties specified the principal agents who were to carry out the educational provisions. These included federal, state, and private organizations. Within the federal government, a variety of committees and departments were involved with Native legislation. In the early nineteenth century, the War Department was given major responsibility for Native matters (Deloria, n.d., p. 77). Eventually, in 1849, this power was transferred to the BIA in the newly created Department of the Interior. Even though most of the influence and decision-making power were held by these two departments, other departments or agencies were allocated service functions toward educating Natives (ibid., p. 78). These included the State Department, which managed the records of Native treaties (ibid., p. 80), and the Treasury Department, which controlled the financial means and matters connected with Native affairs (ibid., p. 82).

In some cases, treaties have designated state or private agents to manage services. The first Native treaty to stipulate the presence of a private (missionary) organization to educate Natives was completed on August 13, 1803, with the Kaskaskias of Indiana (Deloria, n.d., p. 91; Fischbacher, 1967, p. 50). It was not uncommon for the government to fund religious organizations whose role was to educate Native children. This practice came to an end, however, with the act of March 2, 1917 (Deloria, n.d., p. 94). The state's role in Native affairs increased as the federal government's ability to fulfill its promises made in the treaties slipped. The act of March 2, 1901, federally recognized the state's right to school lands on reservations without enjoining the tribe (ibid., p. 96).

Native treaties have played a pivotal role in establishing the contemporary system of Native education. The United States government has a responsibility to fulfill treaty promises to educate Natives "in the context of preceding legal theories and the historical context in which they understand the development of the legal obligations of the United States" (Deloria n.d., p. 103).

Title_-_Treaties Mentioned in Deloria's Manuscript

1819 Treaty with the Cherokees (7 Stat. 195)
Support for Schools on Reservation
1819 Treaty with the Chippewas (7 Stat. 203)
Verbal Promise for Education of Children
1820 Treaty with the Choctaws (7 Stat. 210)
Support for Schools on Reservation
1825 Treaty with the Choctaws (7 Stat. 234)
Support for Schools on Reservation
1825 Treaty with the Creeks (7 Stat. 237)
Technical Education in Agriculture of the Mechanical Arts
1825 Treaty with the Osage (7 Stat. 240)
Support for Schools on Reservation
1831 Treaty with the Menominees (7 Stat. 342)
Support for Schools on Reservation
1832 Treaty with the Florida Indians (7 Stat. 224)
Support for Schools on Reservation
1833 Treaty with the Pawnees (7 Stat. 448)
Support for Schools on Reservation
1845 Treaty with the Creeks and Seminoles (9 Stat. 821)
Support for Schools on Reservation
1846 Treaty with the Potawatomies, Chippewas, and Ottawas
(9 Stat. 853)
Support for Schools on Reservation
1854 Treaty with the Rogue River Indians (10 Stat. 1119)
Support for Schools on Reservation
1854 Treaty with the Nisqually, Puyallup and Other Indians
(10 Stat. 1132)
Technical Education in Agriculture of the Mechanical Arts
1855 Treaty with the Mississippi, Pillager, and Lake Winibigoshish Chippewas (10 Stat. 1165)
Technical Education in Agriculture of the Mechanical Arts
1855 Treaty with the Yakimas (12 Stat. 951)
Support for Schools on Reservation
1863 Treaty with the Mississippi, Pillager, and Lake Winibigoshish Chippewas (12 Stat. 1249)
Support for Schools on Reservation
1863 Treaty with the Nez Perce (14 Stat. 647)
Support for Boarding Schools (Deloria, n.d., pp. 42-69)

IST OF TREATIES WITH INDIAN TRIBES WHICH INCLUDED EDUCATIONAL PROVISIONS

Providing for Technical Education in Agriculture of the Mechanical Arts

1804 Treaty with the Delaware Tribe (7 Stat. 81)
1821 Treaty with the Ottawa, Chippewa and Pottawatamie (7 Stat. 218)
1825 Treaty with the Creek Nation (7 Stat. 237)
1831 Treaty with the Menomonee Indians (7 Stat. 342)
1833 Treaty with the Otocs and Missourias (7 Stat. 429)
1836 Treaty with the Ottawa and Chippewa (7 Stat. 491)
1836 Treaty with the Sacs, Foxes and other Indians (7 Stat. 511)
1836 Treaty with the Otocs and other Indians (7 Stat. 524)
1845 Treaty with the Creeks and Seminoles (9 Stat. 821, 822)
1846 Treaty with the Winnebago Indians (9 Stat. 878)
1847 Treaty with the Chippewas (9 Stat. 904)
1848 Treaty with the Menomonee Tribe (9 Stat. 952)
1851 Treaty with the Sioux (10 Stat. 949)
1851 Treaty with the Sioux Indians (10 Stat. 954)
1854 Treaty with the Menomonee (10 Stat. 1064)
1854 Treaty with the Nisqually and other Indians (10 Stat. 1132)
1855 Treaty with the Blackfoot Indians (11 Stat. 657)
1855 Treaty with the Dwamish and other Indians (12 Stat. 927)
1855 Treaty with the S'Klallams (12 Stat. 933)
1855 Treaty with the Makah Tribe (12 Stat. 939)
1855 Treaty with the Quinaielt, etc., Indians (12 Stat. 971)
1855 Treaty with the Flathead, etc., Indians (12 Stat. 975)
1855 Treaty with the Molels (12 Stat. 981)
1857 Treaty with the Pawnees (11 Stat. 729)
1864 Treaty with the Chippewa Indians (14 Stat. 657)
1866 Treaty with the Creek Nation (14 Stat. 785)
1867 Treaty with the Sac and Fox Indians (15 Stat. 495)
1867 Treaty with the Sissiton, etc., Sioux (15 Stat. 505)

Providing Support for Schools on Reservations

1828 Treaty with the Cherokee Nation (7 Stat. 311)
1835 Treaty with the Cherokee (7 Stat. 478)
1846 Treaty with the Pottowantomie Nation (9 Stat. 853)
1854 Treaty with the Chippewa Indians (10 Stat. 1109)
1854 Treaty with the Chastas, etc., Indians (10 Stat. 1122)
1855 Treaty with the Walla-Wallas, etc. (12 Stat. 945)
1855 Treaty with the Nez Perces (12 Stat. 957)
1858 Treaty with the Mancton Sioux (11 Stat. 743)
1858 Treaty with the Poncas (12 Stat. 997)
1865 Treaty with the Crower Brule Sioux (14 Stat. 699)
1867 Treaty with the Senecas, etc. (15 Stat. 513)
1867 Treaty with the Kiowa and Comanche Indians (15 Stat. 581)
1867 Treaty with the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Indians (15 Stat. 589)
1867 Treaty with the Cheyenne and Arapahoe Indians (15 Stat. 593)
1868 Treaty with the Ute Indians (15 Stat. 619)
1868 Treaty with the Sioux Nation (15 Stat. 635)
1868 Treaty with the Crow Indians (15 Stat. 649)
1868 Treaty with the Northern Cheyenne and Northern Arapahoe Indians (15 Stat. 655)
1868 Treaty with the Navajo Tribe (15 Stat. 667)
1868 Treaty with the Eastern Band of Shoshones and Bannock Tribe of Indians (15 Stat. 673)

Providing for the Support of Boarding Schools

1827 Treaty with the Creek Nation (7 Stat. 307)
1832 Treaty with the Winnebago Nation (7 Stat. 370)
1834 Treaty with the Chickasaw Indians (7 Stat. 450)
1863 Treaty with the Nez Perce Tribe (14 Stat. 647)
1867 Treaty with the Chippewa of Mississippi (16 Stat. 719)

Providing for Schools and/or Teachers in General Terms

1820 Treaty with the Choctaw Nation (7 Stat. 210)
1825 Treaty with the Kansas Nation (7 Stat. 244)
1826 Treaty with the Chippewa Tribe (7 Stat. 290)
1837 Treaty with the Sac and Fox Indians (7 Stat. 543)
1842 Treaty with the Wyandott Nation (7 Stat. 581)
1846 Treaty with the Comanche, etc., Indians (9 Stat. 844)
1854 Treaty with the Miami Indians (10 Stat. 1093)
1854 Treaty with the Rogue River Indians (10 Stat. 1119)
1854 Treaty with the Umpqua, etc., Indians (10 Stat. 1125)
1855 Treaty with the Ottowas and Chippewas (11 Stat. 621)
1856 Treaty with the Stockbridge and Munsee Tribes (11 Stat. 663)
1855 Treaty with the Yakama Indians (12 Stat. 951)
1855 Treaty with the Oregon Indians (12 Stat. 963)
1858 Treaty with the Sioux bands (12 Stat. 1031)
1859 Treaty with the Chippewa bands (12 Stat. 1105)
1861 Treaty with the Arapahses and Cheyenne Indians (12 Stat. 1163)
1861 Treaty with the Sacs, Foxes and Iowas (12 Stat. 1171)
1862 Treaty with the Ottawa Indians (12 Stat. 1237)
1864 Treaty with the Chippewas (13 Stat. 693)
1865 Treaty with the Snake Indians (14 Stat. 683)
1866 Treaty with the Seminole Indians (14 Stat. 755)
1866 Treaty with the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nation (14 Stat. 769)
1868 Treaty with the Nez Perce Tribe (15 Stat. 693)

Providing Contributions for Educational Puroses

1826 Treaty with the Potawatamie Tribe (7 Stat. 295)
1828 Treaty with the Potowatamie Indians (7 Stat. 317)
1830 Treaty with the Sacs and Foxes, etc. (7 Stat. 328)
1830 Treaty with the Choctaw Nation (7 Stat. 333)
1832 Treaty with the Creek Tribe (7 Stat. 366)
1833 Treaty with the Creek Nation (7 Stat. 417)
1846 Treaty with the Kansas Indians (9 Stat. 842)
1850 Treaty with the Wyandot Tribe (9 Stat. 987)
1854 Treaty with the Ottoe and Missouria Indians (10 Stat. 1038)

1854 Treaty with the Delaware Tribe (10 Stat. 1048)
1854 Treaty with the Shawnees (10 Stat. 1053)
1854 Treaty with the Ioway Tribe (10 Stat. 1069)
1854 Treaty with the Kaskaskia, etc., Indians (10 Stat. 1082)
1855 Treaty with the Willamette Bands (10 Stat. 1143)
1855 Treaty with the Chippewa Indians of Mississippi (10 Stat. 1165)
1855 Treaty with the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians (11 Stat. 611)
1855 Treaty with the Chippewa Indians of Saginaw (11 Stat. 633)
1856 Treaty with the Creeks and Seminoles (11 Stat. 699)
1862 Treaty with the Kickapoo Tribe (13 Stat. 623)
1863 Treaty with the Chippewa Indians (13 Stat. 667)
1865 Treaty with the Osage Indians (14 Stat. 687)

Note: The spelling of some tribal names varies considerably in the different treaties.
(Fischbacher 1967, pp. 249-251)

A Matter of Adequacy

On March 9, 1990, the World Conference on Education for All made the following statement in support of the establishment of educational equity for all:

Recalling that education is a fundamental right for all people, women and men, of all ages, throughout our world:

Understanding that education can help ensure a safer, healthier, more prosperous and environmentally sound world, while simultaneously contributing to social, economic, and cultural progress, tolerance, and international cooperation;

Knowing that education is an indispensable key to, though not a sufficient condition for, personal and social improvement;

Recognizing that traditional knowledge and indigenous cultural heritage have a value and validity in their own right and a capacity to both define and promote development;

Acknowledging that, overall, the current provision of education is seriously deficient and that it must be made more relevant and qualitatively improved, and made universally available;

Recognizing that sound basic education is fundamental to the strengthening of higher levels of education and of scientific and technological literacy and capacity and thus to self-reliant development; and

Recognizing the necessity to give to present and coming generations an expanded vision of, and a renewed commitment to, basic education to address the scale and complexity of the challenge. (Haddad, 1990, pp. 3-4)

The conference went on to outline goals and methods for achieving education for all and emphasized that undeserved groups need to be targeted if progress is ever to be made. Without this focus it is not possible to expect progress toward educating all "ethnic, racial, and linguistic minorities" (ibid., p. 5). Native education in this country must be an example to the world.

In order for any educational effort to be successful those who are going to be educated must take a leadership role in the process. Native communities must be involved in the mechanics of determining needs and goals and developing materials, delivery systems, and assessment tools. Tribes must determine what constitutes an adequate education for Native students.

Federal programs officers often encounter a conflict of interest in determining funding levels required for Native education because they also face an obligation to reduce federal budgets. As we will see, in many programs, the funds are not allocated to meet the need; rather, total funds are divided between Native groups according to formulas or grant procedures. This practice must stop.

Current Funding Sources and Where the Money Goes

Without question, the BIA and The Office of Indian Education are leaders in the funding of Native education. They are not, however, the only funders of Native education. Details of specific funding sources will be discussed later in this paper.

The BIA operates 92 elementary and secondary schools and eight accompanying dormitories. The BIA also funds 74 elementary and secondary schools, with six dormitories, through tribally contracted schools. In addition, the BIA funds specific programs that operate in the BIA schools and in public schools. Again, more details will follow elsewhere in this paper.

The BIA also funds two post-secondary schools and 22 tribally controlled community colleges. Additional higher education funds are provided in the form of scholarships.

The Office of Indian Education funds programs through its various subparts. Subpart 1 provides funding to 1,152 Local Education Agencies: 115 are public schools, 57 are contract schools, and 80 are BIA-operated schools. Subpart 1 serves

279,000 students at a per-pupil cost of $142. Subpart 1-ICS provides discretionary grants. In FY 1990 18 programs were funded, 12 of which were new grants. 4,600 participants were served at a per pupil cost of $750. (See Commissioned Paper 2 of the Supplemental Volume for a discussion of the growth of enrollment of Native students in public schools.)

Subpart 2 funding is as follows:

Planning, Pilot and Demonstration
11 new awards
5 continuation
3,900 students served
$472 per pupil cost

Education Services
16 new awards
10 continuation
4,500 students served
$920 per pupil costs

Education Personnel Development
1 new award
6 continuation
280 participants
$4,100 per pupil costs

Resource Centers
6 centers were funded

Fellowships
128 awards
62 new awards
66 continuation
Range of funding was $1,200--$32,000

Gifted and Talented
1 program was funded in 1990

Subpart 3: Adult Education funded
18 new programs
12 continuation
Range of funding was $45,000--$250,000
7,300 participants
$560 per student cost. (Brescia, 1991, February 26)

These programs represent the bulk of programs in Native education. For better or worse, Native education has clearly become dependent upon these agencies. The funding cycles of these two federal agencies dominate the life cycle of Native education.

Effects of Remote Location and Sparse Population

Most Native students served by the BIA live some distance from their schools and are widely separated from each other. This predicament has a negative effect on funds provided by the ISEP formula. Currently the law provides for Native schools to receive payments equal to those given to public schools in that same district. This distribution system is unfair and ineffective. The formula should be modified so that the distribution system "will take into account what education will cost in any particular district given the circumstances under which that district operates" (Report P.L. 95-561, p. 1).

The current BIA system is invalid because it assumes that there is an equal amount of funds available to bureau and tribally operated schools and local public schools. This assumption is not accurate because bureau and tribal schools receive funds only from the federal government, whereas public schools receive funds from local, county, state, and federal sources.

The following tables (Tables B and C) will show how comparison between BIA schools and local school districts does not work.

All fifteen BIA and contract schools have higher per-pupil funding than the Gallup-McKinley local public school district. Gallup-McKinley comprises a geographic area approximately the size of Connecticut. It has twenty-eight school buildings, and it ranks third in the state in student population. It is not an appropriate district to compare with the fifteen single-unit BIA schools, which have enrollments ranging from 54 to 898 (Report P.L. 95-561, p. 2). Comparing BIA and contract schools to New Mexico public school districts of comparable size (Table B) gives a more accurate picture of equalized funding.

All but two of the fifteen BIA schools are below the per pupil funding levels of their counterpart (Report P.L. 95-561, p. 27). The high per-pupil costs connected with small public school districts are consistent throughout the United States. A careful examination of the two preceding tables reveals that small schools are more expensive to operate. It does not show that larger schools are more effective, only that they are more efficient. There is a large body of literature showing that small schools are more effective (Gregory & Smith, 1988). The difference in cost in running small BIA and contract schools is related to their location and sparse populations. Even the small public schools referenced in these tables take extraordinary measures to finance the extra costs of isolation. For example, in only four of the fifteen public schools do teachers salaries' exceed the state average.

Bureau schools consistently fall far behind their state counterparts in funding education. The national average per-pupil expenditure for Native schools is approximately $2,500; in Minnesota it is $4,128; in South Dakota, it is $3,830; in Nebraska, $3,543 (Schutt, 1990, pp. 3-5). I believe that only in Minnesota is the amount adequate to fund ex-

cellent education, which means that once again Native education is lagging behind in a race with the wrong schools. Native educators should be comparing their systems with the best educational systems in the United States, regardless of their geographical relationship. What kind of perverse logic would force Native children to live *down* to state education systems that are not providing an adequate education to their students?

Unique Transportation Requirements in Rural Areas

The current BIA ISEP formula does include transportation. This causes serious problems. In the 1989-90 school year there was a national shortfall of over $100,000 in the transportation budget which had to be taken out of the regular school instructional budget.

> The BIA budget request for student transportation continues to decline, yet the costs of transportation continue to increase. Schools are thus forced to use their instructional (ISEF) funds to make up the shortfall. This apparently undermines the intended purpose of instructional funding and limits the educational programs the schools can run (Barbero, 1990, p. 3-4).

The BIA has tried to hide this continuing deficit in transportation by folding that expense back into the regular school budget. Because of the tribes' strenuous objections, supplemental transportation allocations have been made; but this practice will not solve the problem of underfunded transportation needs. There should be a separate item in the budget for transportation. This budget should not use the misleading "count day" figure; instead it should strive for a formula that takes into account average student use of the transportation system. Average student use of transportation will give the local school officials an additional incentive to keep students in school and using the system.

Funding to Schools Supporting Native Students

BIA Programs for School Operations

ISEP Formula & Adjustments

The Indian School Equalization Program (ISEP) establishes uniform and direct funding of tribally and BIA--operated day schools, boarding schools, and dormitories. The costs which these funds cover include instruction, boarding, dormitories, bilingual instruction, exceptional child education, intense residential guidance, student transportation, school maintenance and repairs, school board training and funds, pre-kindergarten expenditures, and previously private contract school operation and maintenance.

The formula for the funding of each school is based on weighted student units. Weights are allotted to each program or service offered by the school and then multiplied by the average student body size. Boarding schools are weighted more heavily than non-residential schools, and Alaskan schools are entitled to additional funds. The funds for each school as determined by this formula are then disbursed.

Minimal academic standards have been established to ensure the basic education of Native children in BIA-- and Native-controlled contract schools if they choose to adopt them. The standards include philosophy and goals of the school; administrative requirements; program needs assessment; curriculum development; minimum academic programs/school calendar; kindergarten instructional program; junior high and middle school instructional program; secondary instructional program; grading requirements; student promotion requirements; library/media program; textbooks; counseling services; student activities; school program evaluation and needs assessment; and Office of Indian Education Programs and Agency monitoring and evaluation responsibilities.

The criteria within each of these standards are clearly defined by the BIA and must be met by adopting schools.

FY-1989 funding was $164,290,000. These funds were for the BIA to operate directly or by contract with various tribes some 166 elementary and secondary schools and 14 dormitories. The total number of students served was 39,381 in 23 states, 27,197 in BIA-- operated schools and 12,184 in tribally operated schools. In fiscal year 1989, 40 percent of all schools and over 30 percent of all students were served in tribally operated schools. (See Table 8 for a list of appropriations for BIA education for FY-1988 & 1989.)

Institutionalized Handicapped

This BIA program provides educational and related services to severely handicapped and mentally fragile children between the ages of 5 and 21. Twenty-five private facilities, two tribal institutions, and three state institutions received a total of $1,428,000 to provide services to 147 students.

Handicapped students placed by an agency in a private school or facility to receive special education and additional services are entitled to an

education. Each agency must ensure that every student is provided with special education and related services at no cost to the parents, and the school or facility attended by the student must meet the standards which apply to that facility. The agency must monitor compliance of standards, disseminate applicable standards to each facility, provide opportunity for the schools/facilities to participate in the development of such standards, and ensure that handicapped children have the same rights as non-handicapped students.

School Boards' Expenses and Training

This BIA program is designed to provide training to Natives in all matters relating to education. FY-1989 was the last year for direct funding of this program. In FY-1990 funds were transferred to the ISEP formula and funded as a set-aside in accordance with P.L. 100-297. In FY-1989 funds were used for travel, per diem, stipends, and other costs for meetings; fees for memberships in school board associations; and legal fees. Total FY-1989 funds were $1,235,000.

Each school board is delegated a base sum for its training, with provisions for additional funding at Alaska and off-reservation boarding schools. Training activities in which school boards participate include educational philosophy; legal aspects of being a school board member; school board operations and procedures; fiscal management and formula funding; union negotiations and personnel matters; curricular needs; student rights and responsibilities; and needs assessment. Training ensures that each school board is fully aware of its purpose and responsibilities; it also assists in ensuring that the board is well versed in the day to day and planning operations of the schools.

Expenditures by the school board must be reported and made within the guidelines established by the BIA.

Student Transportation

The transportation costs for students to and from school are determined by a formula which accounts for the number of students using the service and the miles which each student must be driven. The formula does not apply to dormitories which provide their own transportation to the public schools that their students attend. Boarding schools and dormitories receive funding for transportation, but the formula used to determine the amount they receive is different; it may include bus and airplane transportation costs.

The formulas have remained virtually unchanged over the past ten years, with the allotment varying in accordance with enrollment changes and gasoline increases. The formula prices are reviewed and amended each year.

FY-1989 funds for this BIA program were $1,235,000. These funds are used for all costs relating to operation of the BIA--and tribally controlled schools' transportation systems, including costs for vehicle operators, rental of General Services Administration (GSA) vehicle, supplies and equipment, maintenance and repair, and other support costs. The BIA--and tribally controlled schools rely on the GSA for buses and receive a monthly lease rate and a mileage rate. GSA notified all Native schools that the lease rate was going to double because it had not been increased in a long time. The Department of the Interior was turned down by the GSA for a one-- year waiver. It took Senate action to prohibit GSA from enforcing the increase for one year.

Often the GSA does not have the buses that the schools need, or buses are old, access to maintenance is difficult, and the cost is prohibitive. As stated above, these costs are greatly influenced by the isolated locations of schools. This small amount cannot possibly provide the necessary funds. What schools need is money up front to buy and operate their own buses because GSA service centers are expensive and usually far from the Native schools.

Solo Parent

Solo Parent is a small BIA program that is operated in only two schools, Sherman Indian School and Flandreau Indian School. It provides single parents the opportunity to complete their high school education while living at the school with their children. Total FY-1989 funds were $108,000. Considering the disproportionate number of Native single parents, programs such as this should be in place in most Native communities, or better yet, funds should be expended to teach birth control and restraint.

Technical Support (Agency & MIS)

This BIA program includes educational Management Information Systems (MIS) training for field--level staff assistance to the director, Office of Indian Education Programs, and broad technical assistance and leadership for all education programs to local school boards, other Native community members, parents, and other Natives. Total FY-1989 funding was $8,807,000: $8,423,000 for Area/Agency Office and $384,000 for Management Information Systems.

Each school must provide a library and media program which meets state and regional standards. Instructional and service objectives which are consistent with the educational goals of the school must be written. Per student book allotments must be maintained, and the size of the library/media staff is determined by the number of students in the school. Libraries must also include materials which pertain to American Indian and/or Alaska Natives. Audio-visual aids must be available to the students and the staff of each school. Yearly inventories of books and instructional items must be conducted to ensure that the libraries have current materials and can assist in meeting the basic academic standards.

Substance/Alcohol Abuse Education Program

The Indian Education Act authorizes the use of funds for the training of school counselors. In keeping with this mandate, counselors have been trained to deal with alcohol and substance abuse. Money for this training is also allotted for those who wish to pursue postsecondary degrees in alcohol and substance abuse counseling. Specific implementation of such programs within each school has been left to the individual school boards. As national programs may or may not be effective for American Indian and Alaska Native students, individual schools are best equipped to evaluate and determine the needs of their own students. Also, investigation of reported school programs on alcohol/substance abuse showed that curriculum in this area was inadequate and did not meet the needs of the students. Alcohol and substance abuse education, counseling, and prevention should be integrated into the curriculum.

This BIA program is used to provide funds for counselors and staff to equip a program of instruction relating to alcohol and substance abuse prevention and treatment. In FY-1989 the BIA expanded this program with other substance abuse funding from the Department of Education to include a health promotion and disease prevention program and an AIDS program. Total funds in FY-1989 were $2,391,000.

Johnson-O'Malley Program

"The Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1934 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to contract with a state or territory 'for the education, medical attention, agricultural assistance, and social welfare, including relief of distress, of Natives in such state or territory, through the qualified agencies of such state or territory.'" The original intent of the law was to enable states and territories to contract with the federal government to provide services under standards set by the secretary. The law was later amended to allow greater latitude with private agencies, corporations, and subdivisions of states and territories to contract (Strickland, 1982, p. 147).

In response to the economic times, the federal government in the 1930s hoped this legislation would make it possible for the states to work with the federal government to provide services. In 306 contracts 205,705 students were served. The total funding for FY-1989 was $23,000,000. (See Table 4 for a state-by-state breakdown of JOM allocations for FY-1989.)

Johnson-O'Malley is perceived as a major problem by most Native communities that are affected by the program. One reason is that the funding level and commitment keep changing each quarter. There is also the perception that school districts recently lost a lot of money to the BIA through the ISEP formula. Promises were made, which could not be funded, to contract schools and BIA schools to finance their teachers and support services. The BIA funds seem to have been moved out of JOM to finance this other activity. While there is no doubt that ISEP is an important area of funding, this seems to be another case of the federal government attempting to set one Native group off against another.

For JOM to work properly, Native communities need timely and accurate information about the program. JOM often takes a disproportionate amount of time for schools to operate. There is a lack of communication between the different levels of the BIA. A feeling exists that all information must be extracted from the BIA. Information seems to be hidden rather than accessible to schools. Different levels of the BIA give different stories and each level there is a different look at every issue. This lack of consistency makes it impossible for local decision makers to determine the best direction to take. With seemingly so many layers of bureaucracy, one way to save funds would be to cut some of those levels out. The BIA should be accountable to its clients, Native governments, and Native communities (Brescia, 1991, January).

Continuing Education

Appropriations may be made to schools to prevent students from dropping out and encourage them to attend institutions of higher education (see Chart 9, Enrollment of Native Students in Higher Education Institutions). Further, grants can be awarded to institutions of higher education and state and local educational agencies to prepare persons to serve Native students as teachers, coun-

selors, or administrators, or to improve the qualifications of those individuals. Grants may also be earmarked for the development of fellowship programs which lead to advanced degree work.

Fellowships are available to Native students who intend to further their education in fields such as medicine, law, engineering, and business administration. The purpose of this aid is to assist the students in attaining a baccalaureate degree. No more than 10 percent of these fellowships are to be awarded to students who wish to attain further education in the field of alcohol and substance abuse counseling.

Funds appropriated by Congress for the education of Natives may be used for grants, aid, and loans to those students with one-fourth or more Native blood who attend accredited institutions of higher education.

Postsecondary Schools

In FY-1989, $11,556,000 went to fund two institutions, Haskell and SIPI. Haskell received $7,503,000 for 756 students in the fall and 689 students in the spring. Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute received $4,053,000 for 465 students in the fall and 480 students in the spring.

Special Higher Education Scholarships

In FY-1989, $1,960,000 went to two BIA programs that served 346 students. American Indian Scholarships provided a total of $1,800,000 in support to 285 students and a special summer law program at the University of New Mexico provided legal education to 61 students in the amount of $160,000.

Tribally Controlled Community Colleges

The Department of the Interior supports and encourages the operation of tribally controlled community colleges for the continuing education of Native students. These institutions are governed and operated by an Native governments or by the governing bodies of two or more Native governments. Financial assistance is available to those institutions which are governed by a board of directors or trustees who are Native; adhere to goals which promote the needs of Native students; if in operation for more than one year, have a majority of Native students enrolled; and receive a positive determination in a feasibility study.

Financial assistance is available to defray the operational costs of education expenses at community colleges; monies may not be used for religious worship or sectarian instruction. The equation used in determining the amount of money awarded to an institution is based primarily on the number of students the community college serves.

This BIA program has essentially decreased in per-pupil funding of students at the Tribally Controlled Community Colleges that it serves (see Chart 11). It served 21 institutions in 1989 and 22 in 1990. There are many other Native students that could benefit from Native controlled community colleges. The number of sites and amount of support should be increased. The FY-1989 budget was $12,968,000. It provided operating costs for all of the community colleges in Title I, except Navajo Community College which is funded by Title II of the act. Operating costs were $8,489,000 for Title I and $4,113,000 for Title II. An additional $116,000 was used for technical assistance to the colleges. P.L. 99-428 placed $250,000 in endowment for the colleges.

Tribe/Agency Operations

Scholarships

This BIA program provided $28,476,000 for scholarships in FY-1989.

Tribal Colleges Snyder Act Supplement

The Snyder Act was passed in 1921. It stipulates that the BIA, under the Secretary of the Interior, shall direct, supervise, and expend money which Congress appropriates. It was later expanded to include programs which are approved under the Higher Education Act of 1965; at this point, the programs of Native colleges which are in accordance with the Higher Education Act would be supervised by the BIA.

In order for Native colleges to receive federal funds, the BIA would have to ensure that they were following the guidelines as stipulated by the Higher Education act. The Snyder Act is the basic legislative instrument for the majority of federal funding to Native colleges.

Some tribes choose to supplement grants under P.L. 98-192 with funds available through the Indian Priority System. This supplemental appropriation was $932,000 in FY-1989.

Adult Education

The BIA adult education program makes it possible for Native adults to complete high school graduation requirements and prepares them for the General Educational Development test (GED); it helps them to acquire basic literacy and numeracy skills and Adult Basic Education (ABE),

and generally to improve their skills and knowledge. Funds in FY-1989 were $3,138,000. Eighty-eight programs served 12,500 students. (See Table 6 for a breakdown of funding years 1985-1989.)

The BIA has marked those adults having less than five years of formal school training as eligible for adult education programs. Studies have shown that while the national rate of adult illiteracy is 8.3 percent, the rate of Native adultilliteracy is 27 percent. Because of a lack of education in the labor force, programs have been developed to assist those Natives in attaining adequate skills necessary for entry level positions.

Aside from literacy programs on reservations, there have been courses and conferences developed to assist adults with consumer buying, family care, parent-child relations, and citizenship.

Many programs offer courses in a wide range of life-coping skills, ranging from drivers' training to consumer awareness. Continuing education courses are also offered to upgrade skills and knowledge, as well as cultural classes that are requested by the community. Program participants range from students who have recently dropped out of high school to the elderly. (See Table 7 for a breakdown by area office of adult education programs funded in 1989.)

Department of Education

Office of Indian Education

The Indian Education Act of 1972 was developed to meet the needs of Native students of all levels.

Grants may be given to tribally controlled schools in order to cover the costs of training and development, establishing and maintaining programs and training counselors relevant to alcohol and substance abuse. The disbursement of grant money is conditional, based on need and a detailed description of how the funds will be utilized and monitored.

Special Programs for Native Students

Grants may be made and contracts negotiated with institutions of higher education, Native governments and organizations to prepare people for and establish in-service training for teaching and administering special education projects for Native students.

Fellowships may be awarded to Native students to continue their education at the graduate and professional levels. The amount of fellowships will be based on individual need and circumstances.

Centers for gifted and talented Native students have been developed at Sinte Gleska College and the Navajo Community College. Grants have been awarded and contracts entered into with these institutions in order to better identify the needs of gifted and talented elementary and secondary school children. The contract for this program runs until 1993.

Grants may be awarded to agencies, institutions, organizations and Native governments in order to establish, support, operate, research, develop and disseminate programs to improve the education of and employment opportunities of Native adults.

Program Administration

The Office of Indian Education administers all provisions of the Indian Education Act. The Office is headed by the Director of Indian Education who is selected by the Secretary of Education from a list of nominees prepared by the National Advisory Council on Indian Education.

The National Advisory Council on Indian Education is comprised of 15 members, all of whom are American Indian or Alaska Natives. The members are nominated by Tribes and are appointed by the President. The duties of the NACIE are to: advise the Commissioner of Education on administration of programs for Native children and adults; evaluate programs; provide technical assistance to Native agencies, institutions and organizations to promote education; and assist with the evaluation process of those agencies receiving grants.

Subpart 1 covers formula grants to public schools; subpart 1-ICS covers discretionary grants to Native-controlled schools; subpart 2 is for Native children and resource and evaluation centers; and subpart 3 is for Native adults (see Charts 5-7 for funding histories of Indian Education Act 1980-1989).

Bilingual Education

The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 (amended in 1984) addresses the increased number of children who lack English proficiency. The cultural differences of those whose Native language is not English should be valued; retaining their language is an important aspect of preserving the culture. Also, segregation of those students whose primary language, not English, has become an increasingly problematic occurrence.

To promote the philosophy of equality in education, bilingual programs should be offered where applicable and beneficial to the student body. Grant money can be used to develop transitional bilingual education, developmental bilingual

education, family english proficiency programs, and bilingual education for primary, special education, and gifted and talented students.

It is difficult to come up with the exact number of Native students served by this program because several programs serve students from diverse language backgrounds and the breakdown of funds per language is not precise. However, there are a number of programs that serve only Native students. In FY-1989, 1994 programs in 18 states served 15,392 students. Funds going exclusively to Native programs totaled $11,286,180.

There were 2,255 Native students served in 22 programs in 9 states that included but were not restricted to Native students.

This program has a long history of serving Native students. It also has a long history of needing more Natives on staff at the national level. A large proportion of the students served by this program are Natives, and the staff ought to reflect that percentage.

Chapter 1 -- BIA 1 Percent Set-aside

This program is for use at BIA-- and tribally controlled schools. In FY-1989 it served 16,604 students. The total amount of funds for FY-1989 was $25,217,025. The program allocates funds for projects that provide compensatory educational services for disadvantaged students.

Chapter I Formula Grants to Local Education Agencies

This program "provides financial assistance to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children who live in areas with high concentrations of children from low-income families. Recent amendments seek to improve further the educational opportunities of educationally deprived children by helping them succeed in their regular school program, attain grade-level proficiency, and improve achievement in basic and more advanced skills" (Cavazos, 1989, pp. 101-1). Approximately 5 percent of the participants in Chapter I are Natives.

Impact Aid Maintenance and Operations

Impact Aid was begun in 1950 to help local school districts offset the costs of educating children who attend a public school but are not part of the tax base. Funds are allocated in accordance with a complex formula that is based on average daily attendance. In FY-1990, 1,844,604 students were served, of which 111,262 were Natives. Though the final figures are not in, it appears that the total amount spent for Native students will be about the same as in FY-1989, $239,355,638.

This money goes directly to the schools to be used as they see fit. Most of it is spent on teachers' salaries, as is true of most school budgets nationwide. The only requirement relating to spending the Native monies is that a parent advisory board exist and be consulted. These advisory boards have no real control over the use of the money (Brescia, 1991). Impact Aid is a rare breed of federal program; it gives the LEAs a blank check and is in need of revision. At the least, schools receiving these funds should be required to have the number of representatives on their school boards be in proportion to the number of students attending the school. I would also recommend that a member of the Native community be given a leading role in the finance committee.

Impact Aid Construction P.L. 81-815

These funds are for LEAs that serve Native students for construction and renovation of their facilities. Funds obligated in 1989 were $7,681,000.

Income guidelines govern eligibility for this program. Participants must also be from a federally recognized Native group to participate. In FY-1989, 14,202 were served by 106 tribal organizations from a budget of $41,773,791.

Vocational Education 1.25 Percent Set-aside

In 1956, the Secretary of the Interior was authorized to develop vocational training programs to assist adult Natives residing on or near American Indian reservations. The purpose of this authorization was to help those Native adults needing to obtain reasonable and satisfactory jobs. Programs include vocational guidance and counseling, institutional training, apprenticeships, and on-the-job training. Contracts may be entered into with any state, federal, or local governmental agency or private school which is recognized for vocational education and training.

This program funds federally recognized tribes and Alaska Native villages. In FY-1989 it funded 40 projects. The total expenditure was $10,808,990, and approximately 2,300 Native students were served. Considering the documented need for these kinds of services, this level of funding is inadequate (see Chart 2, Vocational Education, for the funding history of this program in 1980-1989).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Vocational Rehabilitation 0.25 Percent Set-aside

The set-aside for FY-1989 was $3,625,000 for a total of 14 programs (see Chart 3 for the Funding history of vocational rehabilitation in 1981-1989). Approximately 3,000 Native students were served.

Institutional Aid

This Department of Education program gave institutional self-sufficiency grants to predominantly Native institutions. Ten institutions received $2,401,904.

Library Services for Indian Tribes and Hawaiian Natives Program

Library Services for Indian Tribes was established after the inadequacy of present library services to and for Natives became evident. The rationale behind this program is to offer a public service to those on or near reservations and to create incentives for the improvement of existing tribal library programs and their administration. Grants for this program go toward in-service training of library staff; purchase of library materials; library programs for Natives; salaries for library staff; library construction; transportation for access to library facilities by those on or near reservations; dissemination of information about library services; and access to tribal needs.

This program awards direct grants to federally recognized Native governments and Alaska Native villages. A total of $1,836,525 was given to Native governments. The total included 159 basic grants equaling $598,090 and 17 special grants totalling $1,238,435. Basic grants in 1989 were for $3,629. Basic grants are used to initiate or supplement libraries in eight areas: assessment, training, personnel, library materials, dissemination, transportation, special programs, and construction. Special project grants are competitive and are made with unused funds after the basic grants are awarded. A tribe must have a basic grant to compete for a special project grant. Special projects require matching funds for 20 percent of the total costs of the project. They must be part of a long-range plan of three to five years and must be administered by a librarian. In 1989 grants ranged from about $20,000 to more than $170,000. An additional $612,175 was given to Hawaiian Natives.

Education of the Handicapped Set-aside 1.25 Percent, P.L. 94-142.

This bureau program provides funds for the special educational needs of handicapped Native children from birth to age 21. In FY-1989 $18,286,876 was used to serve 6,762 students.

Math & Science Education Set-aside 0.5 Percent

The National Science Foundation Program for Partnerships in Education for Mathematics, Science and Engineering was developed in order to increase the quality of instruction, awarding scholarships and purchasing equipment in these areas. Local educational agencies are permitted to petition for grant money to improve and develop these academic programs.

The stipulations attached to receiving grant money include holding administrative costs to no more than 5 percent of the amount and making sure that there is no conflict of interest between those instructing in math, science, and engineering and any local businesses which may be contributing to the development of these academic programs. The program also stipulates that no more than 15 percent of the total funds available may be awarded to any one state.

The program provides training to bureau school math and science teachers. FY-1989 funding was $598,375.

Drug Free Schools & Communities Set-aside 1.0 percent

The Drug Free Schools Act of 1986 was passed to assist in the prevention, detection, and rehabilitation of substance/alcohol abuse (see Chart 4, Drug-Free Schools: Indian Youth Program, for a funding history 1987-1989). Prompted by concern about the use of alcohol by youth and illegal drugs, the government provided a financial incentive to help schools alleviate the problem. Monies appropriated to local educational agencies must be used to develop, implement, evaluate, and integrate drug and alcohol abuse programs. Money can be used to train teachers/counselors and to provide school-based education and early intervention programs, treatment and rehabilitation facilities, and community education.

Local educational agencies must apply for the grants by preparing in writing specific programs which will be set up, goals, and evaluation procedures.

Funds can go to BIA-- or tribally controlled schools for alcohol and drug abuse prevention programs. FY-1989 funding was $3,475,000.

Office of Construction Management

New school construction is based on an established ranking process published in the Federal Register. The Repair and Improvement Program

is based on priority--ranked input from BIA area offices. The program budget for FY-1989 was $33,650,000, with $9,190,000 for education projects, $500,000 for Planning & Design, and $23,960,000 for Improvements.

Essentially, the majority of Native schools are outdated; they have space that does not meet contemporary educational requirements and buildings that have generally been poorly maintained. Congress has been funding roughly two or three new school construction projects annually. At that rate, the backlog would not be eliminated until well into the next century. There has to be some real commitment to capital improvement for new school construction. Instead of $5,000,000-10,000,000 a year, it should be closer to $30,000,000-40,000,000. The current backlog for FI&R (Facilities, Improvement and Repair) is approaching $200,000,000. That work should certainly be new construction. Construction is being finessed by putting projects on FI&R because it is easer to obtain that money. Many old schools simply must be rebuilt. There should be a new process to get this accomplished. The bureau's procedure for school construction and space requirements are outmoded and dysfunctional. A flat requirement per child of 135 square feet does not take into account extra educational programs such as Chapter I or Gifted and Talented. The bureau process for planning schools and designing schools is out of step with contemporary educational thinking. Children cannot be educated in square boxes.

There has to be an aggressive school replacement program. The bureau should take the lead in determining enrollment projections and implementing a planning process that takes into account constructing buildings that support educational programs.

Star Schools

The Star Schools Program was developed in order to improve instruction in math, science and foreign language as well as vocational education through telecommunication partnerships. Grants are made available to assist in the development, construction and acquisition of telecommunications video and audio equipment for instructional programming to improve those academic areas.

Star Schools is a high-technology project designed to provide instruction and teacher training in foreign languages (I assume English is not being included as a foreign language) and science to schools via satellite. This bureau project is funded through the Department of Education grant to TI-IN United Star Network in San Antonio, Texas. Sixteen sites are served across the United States. The total funding for FY-1989 was $5,700,000. I believe this project shows a great deal of promise and should be expanded to provide instruction to all reservations. This technology, if controlled locally, can make delivery of quality instruction cost-effective and can help support Native values and culture.

Adult Education Programs

Public Law 1201 of Title 20 (Basic Program Revisions) provides assistance to states to create better educational opportunities for adults lacking the literacy skills needed for effective citizenship and productive employment. It is the intention of this law to assist states in helping adults to attain a level of functional literacy, provide adults with basic education they need to participate in job training, and aid those adults who wish to obtain education at least to the level of completion of secondary school.

The Basic State Grants enable the states to fund adult education programs, services, and activities.

State-Administered Basic Grant Program

This is a block grant program of adult education funds that are administered by the individual states. In fiscal year 1990 $157.8 million was appropriated for this effort. This program is analyzed in detail in Commissioned Paper 19 of the Supplemental Volume.

National Workplace Literacy

Grants are available to businesses, labor organizations, private industry councils, state and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education and schools which have shown excellence in workplace literacy.

These grants pay the federal portion of the adult education programs which teach literacy skills to workers. These funds may be used to provide and improve services, training, programs and counseling.

This program is designed to foster partnerships between schools and businesses to improve the basic literacy skills needed in the workplace. Curriculum materials include reading and math materials used on the job to increase relevancy for the learners. This program received $9.5 million in funding in Fiscal Year 1989, $11.9 million in FY 1990, and $19.7 million in FY 1991. Of the 300 or so applications received in FY 1990, 10% were funded, and no grants were made to Native communities in FY 1989 or FY 1990. One Native

community applied in FY 1991; grant awards were announced after this report went to press.

The program officer speculated that the reason for the dearth of applications from Native communities is the requirement that the applications be partnerships between educational or community-based organizations, and business/industry groups, primarily Private Industry Councils. The tribe that applied in FY 1991 sought and received a waiver from the Department of Education to allow its partnership to be between the tribe as a community-based organization and tribal businesses, since there was no Private Industry Council on the reservation. The intent of the legislation was clearly to include Native communities, and the program officer interviewed hopes to receive more applications from tribes in the FY 1992 cycle. $19.3 million will be available in FY 1992; the official announcement of the program will be made in April 1991, with a deadline for applications sometime in July. (Garkinkle, 1991, February 19)

State-Administered Workplace Literacy Program

States which have approved workplace literacy plans may also be eligible for grants. These monies may be used for funding up to 70 percent of the cost to run adult workplace literacy programs, administrative costs and expenses incurred by the state in evaluating such programs.

This program was authorized in the 1988 amendments to the Adult Education Act, but to date, the Congress has appropriated no funds for the program. The program serves to support workplace literacy programs at the state level.

State-Administered English Literacy Program

States which have plans to operate, improve and establish English literacy programs may also be eligible for grants. These programs are developed to assist in improving the English skills of those individuals who lack English proficiency. In order to receive such a grant, the state must show the number of individuals who would benefit from English literacy programs, the activities which will promote literacy, how those served will benefit, and resources needed to accomplish this goal.

Grant money can be taken away from a state only if the state has not made substantial progress in its goals when such programs are no longer needed.

Funds have been used for state grants and demonstration projects to promote English literacy for limited-English proficient adults. This program was funded in FY 1989 ($4.9 million) and FY 1990 ($5.9 million), but no money was appropriated for FY 1991. Data on Native involvement is unavailable at the federal level, although each state is required to assemble such data for its program. (Garkinkle, 1991, February 20)

National English Literacy Demonstration Program for Individuals of Limited English Proficiency

The English literacy demonstration program makes available funds through grants and contracts with public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions and organizations. These funds are to be used to develop new approaches to literacy for adults with limited English proficiency through the use of innovative technologies and teaching methodologies. Also, these funds are to be used to establish the Center for Applied Linguistics of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement as the national clearinghouse on literacy education for those adults with limited English proficiency. This clearinghouse shall collect and disburse information pertaining to effective methods and geared toward English proficiency programs.

The limited funds under this program have been used to establish an English as a Second Language (ESL) clearinghouse. A grant of $244,000 was made to the English Literacy Center to begin this effort. More money may be forthcoming. The legislation authorizing this program also intended for funds to support the development of innovative approaches and methods in English literacy, especially taking advantage of new instructional methods and technologies. (Garkinkle, 1991, February 20)

Adult Migrant Farmworker and Immigrant Education Program

Grants are available to states and local eligible recipients to assist in the planning, development and evaluation of programs which provide adult education services and activities suited to the needs of migrant farmworkers and immigrants. Priority will be given to the development of educational programs for migrant farmworkers.

No program funds have been appropriated for migrant education to date, but a small amount of money was found to conduct a study of what the needs of the population were. This study is intended to help adult education administrators and teachers in planning, developing and evaluating effective literacy program for adult migrant farmworkers. The Office of Vocational and Adult

Education in the Department of Education contracted the report from Slaughter & Associates, Woodland Hills, California. (Garkinkle, 1991, February 21)

National Adult Literacy Volunteer Training Program

Planning, implementation and evaluation of programs which train adult volunteers who wish to assist in adult literacy education may be funded through grants to states and local eligible recipients. This program was authorized in the 1988 amendments to the Adult Education Act, but to date the Congress has appropriated no funds for the program. The intent is to provide grants to support training of adult volunteers, especially senior citizens, to participate as tutors in local adult education programs.

State Program Analysis Assistance and Policy Studies

States may be assisted in program analysis and policy studies of adult literacy opportunities. Through these studies, the national illiterate adult population should be assessed, and a report on the status of adult literacy and education shall be made to establish the national trends. The national report will be submitted to the President and the appropriate Congressional committees on the status of literacy and adult education.

This is a set of evaluation and research studies conducted by the Program Services Branch in the Adult Education and Literacy Division. Activities include a series of evaluation studies, a case study analysis of adult education programs and services, and an analysis of adult education data collected by various sources. A major national adult literacy survey is being undertaken by the Educational Testing Service; this survey will include a national household study to be performed in 1993.

Native populations are only partially identified under the Adult Education and Literacy Division's efforts. One reason for this may be that there are separate monies for Native literacy programs in the Office of Indian Education. Most of the Natives tracked by the Program Services Branch are those off the reservations. Most of the evaluation work done by this program does not break out Native populations served; the usual breakdowns are white, Hispanic, black, and other. A summary report of this Branch's activities will be published in August 1991. (Garkinkle, 1991, February 22)

Head Start

Native Head Start programs were started in the summer of 1964 as pilot programs. The next year the overall program was continued. Today there are programs in 24 states.

Funding for all Head Start programs was $ 1,386,315,000 in 1990, with Native programs accounting for 4% of the total. Approximately 15,000 Native students make up 4% of the total population of Head Start students. In FY 1990 106 programs were funded, and all but three of those were to specific tribes; the remaining three were to intertribal councils. Handicapped programs received 13.5% of the funds. The total enrollment average cost per pupil was $2,767 (Brescia, 1991 February 26).

Indian Health Scholarship Program

Scholarship money under the national Scholarship Program shall be made available to physicians, osteopaths, dentists, veterinarians, nurses, optometrists, podiatrists, pharmacists, public health personnel and allied health professionals in order to provide services needed by Natives.

Most years this program is lucky to fund 40 percent of the applicants. This shows a strong interest in and a need for more funds in this area. FY-1989 funds totaled $7,896,000.

Institute of American Indian Arts (IAIA)

The Institute of American Indian Arts has separated itself from the BIA and has moved to a new campus. Meeting its Congressional mandate, it has implemented several new programs and courses and has increased student enrollment substantially. In FY-1989 IAIA served 160 students with $3,093,000. Given all the talk these days about improving math and science skills, I think such programs should be encouraged and fostered. I would hate to see this part of our culture lost to the needs of a high-technology society.

Minority Science Improvement Program

Predominantly Native institutions received discretionary grants totaling $548,523 to help them improve their science and engineering education programs. Seven institutions served 1,239 students.

(See table 5 for an overview of programs benefiting American Indian and Alaska Native students in FY-1989.)

NOTE: much of the information in this section came from the NACIE 16th Annual Report.

There are undoubtedly other sources that provide some funds to Native education. For those of

you who work with and for those programs, it was not my intention to leave anyone out. I believe that what I have presented here is a good overview of the major federal funding sources.

Impact Aid--Does It Work?

Nationwide there is a feeling in Native communities that schools are not targeting enough of the Impact Aid funds they receive to Native students. There is concern about the way monies come back down to the districts for special education purposes as well as for the regular education program. Native communities feel that they do not have enough say about how the Native set-aside monies are prioritized, and budgeted, and about the overall operations of school districts that receive Impact Aid.

Although school administrators say that everything is going well, Native people feel they are kept on the outside of the decision-making process. In many places the policies and procedures are in place and clear, but they actually do not allow dialogue and consultation with Native governments and parents. Many school districts are out of compliance with these policies and procedures, often because of a lack of knowledge of the law. Districts have been known to write up their budgets using the 874 monies with no communication with the Native community.

While the funds in Impact Aid are often viewed as being non-categorical, they are still subject to review and consultation involving Native governments and parents. Many school districts are in compliance on paper, but in actual practice nothing has changed to include Native people in the process. Districts are free to fill out their compliance forms without follow up to guarantee accuracy. Native communities need policing authority to ensure the compliance. The law as it stands now is close to being workable if it were implemented fully and properly.

One improvement that could easily be made is for program support staff to know more about Native communities and Native governments. Many of them seem to be moved around from other federal programs and come to Impact Aid with unfounded assumptions about Natives. Some staff are not familiar with the statutes and practices and are attempting to work with school districts and Native communities on Impact Aid. There is a possibility of confusion, and mixed messages can be sent to the school districts and Native communities. Staff should be literate in Impact Aid and about Native communities. It is difficult now to find people who fill that bill. The technicians who work at Impact Aid should be experts who can give technical assistance to Native communities. If staff were more knowledgeable, they could be more responsive to Native concerns.

Congress should continue to make Impact Aid a priority. It would be helpful if there were not always a battle to keep this program consistent. Its funding should be increased along with inflation because it is so closely tied to fixed costs of the school. Improvements have been made over the last five years, but much work still needs to be done. Native communities, states, and Impact Aid need to work together to make sure that school districts are in compliance (Brescia, 1991).

Need for Forward Funding

Forward funding has been a serious problem because BIA-- funded schools, unlike public schools, do not know what their final budget figures are until after Congress has appropriated funds during that year. In a good year Congress might have completed the BIA school budget by September 15; count week is in October, which means that schools will not know their budget for the year until sometime in December. Sometimes final figures are not available until well into the second semester. This lack of forward funding breeds inefficiency and waste. Schools often delay filling positions and buying necessary supplies until they receive their money, and then they are forced to spend what money does come in in the last three months of school. So that money ends up being spent on "stuff" rather than instruction.

Lack of forward funding also compounds the under-count problem. Without using an average student attendance figure, there is no incentive for BIA schools to keep students in school after count day (Brescia, 1990, December 24).

Investing in the Brightest and Best

The development of postsecondary education for Native students has been slow. The United Presbyterian Church founded Sheldon Jackson College for Alaska Natives in 1878, and the American Baptist Church started "Indian University" for the Creeks in 1880. The latter is today known as Bacone College, in Muskogee, Oklahoma. A school for Native students begun by the state of North Carolina in 1887 became a college in the 1930s and is today Pembroke State University, with an enrollment still approximately 20% Natives. "No additional efforts were undertaken to establish Indian colleges until the 1960's." Instead, Federal efforts focused on establishing vocational schools and providing scholarships for "the

few Native college students to attend majority institutions" (Olivas, 1982, p. 2). Haskell Institute offered the first college preparatory program for Natives in 1963. The Institute of American Indian Arts opened in 1962, and offered high school courses and two additional postsecondary years of "work in areas such as creative writing, sculpture, and design and painting of textiles" (Fries, 1987, p. 5).

With access to higher education so limited, only 66 Natives took baccalaureate degrees in 1961. Seven years later, in 1968, this number had increased nearly three-fold. Even so, a total of only 181 Natives received four-year degrees that year (ibid., p. 5). The Kennedy Report of 1969 sounded a note ominously like that heard in the Merriam Report, and concluded that Natives need "more control over their children's education and schools" (ibid., p. 5).

Starting with Navajo Community College in 1969, some 20 tribally controlled community colleges were established during the 1970s. Other institutions began to increase postsecondary access for Natives by the introduction of ethnic programs. Arizona State University led the way in 1954 with the Arizona State Indian Education Center. The University of New Mexico founded the American Indian Law Center in 1967, and, in 1970, the University of Minnesota began a program to train Native teachers and school administrators. These and other developments resulted in noticeable increases in the enrollment of Native students (ibid., pp. 5,6).

Legislation such as the Civil Rights and the Higher Education Acts of 1965 increased public concern for and support of minority access to higher education. The increased governance of their own postsecondary educational facilities by Native students, especially in the tribally controlled community colleges, also has had a positive impact. Perhaps most notable is the ability to increase students' self-awareness and self-respect by making Native Studies part of degree or certificate requirements, as at Salish Kootenai College, Flathead Indian Reservation, Montana (McDonald and Le Beau, 1983, p. 18). A third positive force on enlarging Native access has been the increase in Federal funds available for both student and institutional aid.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 provides for institutional aid in Title III and for student assistance in Title IV. The Navajo Community College Act of 1971 provided specifically for Federal funding of a community college to be established by Navajos for their own education. Congress made further provision for Federal support of Native education with the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-471). Obtaining grants under P.L. 96-471 has been notoriously difficult because of difficulties in qualifying (Olivas, 1982, pp. 6-10), intergovernmental agency squabbling, and under-funding.

Such difficulties notwithstanding, community colleges have flourished as a result of these funds. The example of Salish Kootenai College is again instructive. A forestry technology program was begun on the Flathead Reservation in 1973. Two years later, assistance was sought as a developing institution under Title III of the Higher Education Act. Beginning in the school year 1976-77, and continuing through 1979-80, Salish Kootenai received a total of $110,000 under Title III, and another $768,200 in 1979-80 and 1980-81 under P.L. 95-471. Additional Federal contracts and grants totaled approximately $800,000 during the same period (McDonald and Le Beau, 1983, p. 16). The result of this large infusion of Federal dollars was a school which served some 1,300 students in 1981-82. Of these, 850 (65.3%) were Natives (ibid., p. 10). As of January, 1990, a total of 20 tribally controlled community colleges had received grants under P.L. 95-471, as reported in the National Advisory Council on Indian Education Scholarship Field guide (Cheek, 1990, pp. 36, 37).

Data from the censuses of 1970 and 1980 show that the number of Natives between the ages of 18 and 24 more than doubled during the decade, and that the proportion graduating from high school increased from 51% to 60% during the same period (ibid., p. 10). The educational attainment of Native students is still substantially behind that of white Americans (Fries, 1987, p. 9). In 1980, 45% of Natives over the age of 25 had not completed high school (compared with 31% of white Americans) and only 7.7% of Natives over 25 had completed four or more years of college (as compared with 17% of white Americans).

Despite the growth in "college-age" Native youth and their increasing high school graduation rate, growth in postsecondary enrollment was mixed. In 1976, 76,110 Native students were enrolled in institutions of higher education in the United States. This number increased by 15% in 1982, to 87,700, but declined to 82,672 in 1984 (ibid., p. 11). As with other minority populations, this decline probably resulted from cuts in financial aid under the Reagan administration.

There was a 20.8% increase in the number of degrees granted to Native students between 1975-76 and 19880-81, from 7,048 to 8,513. The largest increase took place in the number of associate

degrees granted: from 2,522 to 3,574 (41.7%). The next largest increase was in the number of master's degrees granted: from 783 to 1,034 (32.1%). Professional degrees and doctorates increased by 76, from 245 to 321 (31%). Bachelor's degrees increased by only 76, from 3,498 to 3,574 (2.2%). Overall, then, the number of bachelor's and higher degrees increased by only 403, from 4,526 to 4,929 (8.9%) during the period 1975-76 to 1980-81. To place these numbers in perspective, institutions of higher learning across the nation awarded approximately 1.3 million degrees during each of these years (ibid., p. 18).

Perhaps the nation's failure to look after the higher education needs of Native students is best illustrated by the data regarding employment of Natives in the nation's colleges and universities. The total of all faculty and staff in higher learning was reported as approximately 1.6 million in the fall of 1983. Of these, only 6,735 were Natives and some 60% of those were in service occupations. Only 19% were full-time faculty (ibid., p. 25). Even more distressing, none of the Native institutions had a faculty composed primarily of Native educators in 1981 or 1983. "In fact, of the 13 predominantly Native institution reporting for those years, six had no Natives as full-time faculty employed" (Fries, 1987, p. 28).

The NACIE Scholarship Field Guide suggests that the "opportunities for minorities to pursue an education have never been better." This January, 1990 compilation of scholarships, fellowships, and other programs to aid Natives bears this conclusion out. It lists some 27 colleges which are tribally controlled community colleges or member institutions of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, and six predominantly white institutions in four states with programs specifically to benefit Natives or minorities (Cheek, 1990, pp. 36, 37; 27-30). Of the latter many more could be listed today. In addition, this directory also lists approximately 48 scholarships, fellowships, or other programs benefitting Natives/minorities. Of these, 16 are funded by the federal government and 32 by private agencies or organizations. among the Federal programs, five are for Natives only; six benefit all minorities; the remaining five are for any applicant. Among the private programs, 13 benefit only Natives; nine are for all minorities; and anyone may apply for the remaining 10.

There is clearly a problem with recruiting and retaining Native students in four year and research universities. Additional programs should be instituted to help improve and expand the schools in the American Indian Higher Education Consortium. Also students pursuing higher education in traditionally white institutions need assistance in coping with the cultural conflict as well as new academic problems. I suggest that institutions look at methods, practices and curriculum for their faculty, so they know how to teach in a multi-cultural setting, rather than looking at the students to try to fix them.

(Table 9 covers the BIA grant and graduate scholarship programs.)

Scholarships and Fellowships

Voluntary Action for the Public Good: The Role of Foundation Giving in Native Education

The foundations in this study had to meet two simple criteria: they had to give at least $5,000, and they had to be among the top 400 foundations in giving nationally. This does mean that small foundations are left out, but I believe it presents a good picture of foundation giving.

One fundamental point must be understood when discussing foundation giving to Native education, and that is that the total amount is inordinately small. The total is small when compared to foundations' total giving to all causes. It is small when compared to the percentage of Native students in the population (see Chart 10 for 1980-1988 population of Natives in the United States). In virtually all comparisons, foundation giving falls short. Why is it that foundations do not give in this area? Is it because no one is asking? Is it because of a lack of programs? Is it because foundations are not interested in giving? These are all important research and policy questions that need to be addressed. While it would be interesting to look at individual and corporate giving to Native education, it would be virtually impossible given the geographic diversity of Native groups, the need to maintain donor anonymity, and the lack of applicable data bases.

The foundations mentioned in this paper should not be criticized for not giving enough. At least they are giving something. As with all foundation relations, it is better to work with them as friends rather than adversaries.

At no time during 1985-1989, the years I researched, did total foundation giving to Natives exceed 1 percent of total foundation giving. Since giving to education is only part of total foundation giving in this area, giving to Native education is much less than 1 percent.

Geographic Giving from Foundations

It is startling that foundations in 22 of the states gave **nothing** to Native causes. Nearly half the states did not have a foundation that could find a linkage with Native education! Several of these states have large Native populations: Nevada, Utah, Idaho, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota. All of the other states that did not give have Native groups of living within their borders.

The Big Givers

Table D shows examples of grants in the area of education, what subcategory they fell into, and who gave how much to whom.

Far and away the biggest giver in education is the Ford Foundation, with no fewer than 21 grants totaling more than $2,212,278. Most foundations that gave to Native causes gave at least twice; many gave numerous grants.

Also of interest are foundations that gave at least one grant of $80,000 or more. Once again Ford proved to be the leader in this area. Unfortunately, most of the foundations that gave big grants in this area gave only one large grant, showing that they had one project that interested them rather than a commitment to funding Native education projects.

Foundations do give to education more than to any other Native cause except development. In the years 1985-1989 they gave $15,827,694 to education (see Chart 6). Giving to education is almost exclusively to higher education; only a small part goes to elementary and secondary education and other purposes, which are divided into science, adult education, technology, vocational education, and life science. The vast majority of money going to higher education was for fellowships or scholarships; some was for program activity, but this amount was small by comparison. Exactly how much of this scholarship money actually got to Native students is impossible to tell. Undoubtedly some of the money goes for support staff and university/college indirect costs. Funding in other education areas is nearly exclusively of the program nature, with essentially no funds given for basic institutional support.

Not included in the above amounts is funding for legal education, that is, a small amount given by a few foundations with a special relationship with specific Native organizations. These foundations are committed to working with these Native organizations, not to Native education, and stated that they would discontinue funding Native causes of any kind if they did not fund these specific organizations. These foundations are fiercely loyal to the organizations they give to. The reason for this loyalty seems to be based on the competence of those organizations and their ability to show these foundations that their money is being spent the way the foundation wants it spent.

As a rule, foundations have no separate programs for Native education. Money is given to Native groups because a foundation is interested in education without regard to its relevance to Native communities. A few foundations have a special program in one specific area such as higher education or substance abuse. These foundations have developed this interest in funding Native education out of a general interest in funding education (Brescia, 1990).

Native groups need to encourage the efforts that foundations are making in Native education and to involve more foundations in this endeavor.

Can We Do It on Our Own?

Most Native communities have no tax base. Some Native communities may be able to pay part of education funding, unhappily, it will be a long time before any Native community can pay the whole bill. Native communities that have income have only sporadic earnings from energy resources, timber, or fisheries. The Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians spends about $8,000,000 on education-related expenses; even at that they still need about $4,000,000 to meed the needs they have identified. That figure does not even include facilities replacement. Even on reservations where manufacturing provides a steady income, profit is put into debt replacement. There will be no money for education programs support until well into the next century.

It might be possible to "tax" certain activities such as gaming. It is not clear now what gaming could bring in, but it obviously will never be enough to run a school system. That is, of course, assuming that schools were the only expense. What about roads, health care, etc.? "Capital-intensive services such as education and health require costly facilities and suffer diseconomies at smaller scale. Tribes simply do not have the tax base to" support these efforts (Barsh & Diaz-Knauf, 1984, p. 11). The Navajo, for example, have enormous resources, but they also have enormous public service needs. A lot of their population lives without running water or at great distances, from a paved road. The issue is achieving a more entrepreneurial condition on the reservation. But the problem is that the tribes are capital poor. There is no tax base. Until property values improve, Native communities will be unable to sup-

port their school systems. As long as illiteracy exists to the extent that it does on reservations, virtually nothing can happen to create a tax base (Brescia, December, 1990).

Conclusion and Recommendations

Nothing short of a Marshall Plan for Native education will suffice! The federal government has never been willing to do what is needed to bring American Indian and Alaska Native groups up to parity with the larger community. It is not necessary for the federal government to do this on its own. If only 2 percent of total foundations, personal and corporate giving went for this purpose, there would be funds to accomplish part the task. Philanthropy will never be able to replace federal programs but it should lead the way to improvements and restructuring. While the Marshall Plan was influenced strongly by the Truman Doctrine and a desire to control the spread of communism, it did have two points that make it a good model for funding of Native education: first, the basic idea was to support the self-determination of the various European states; and second, large amounts of money were used to build each country's infrastructure.

Native governments and communities should have the same consideration as European governments in determining how they could best use funds to create an environment that fosters the kind of growth they want. Native governments and communities need assistance to raise property values to the point where Native students can be supported by their own governments and communities. For Native education to be improved, funds must be directed to the development of Native communities as well as to the education systems. Charts 12-14 "illustrate the trends in constant dollars for FY1975-1991. [Chart 12] shows the generally upward, but fluctuating, trend for the Department of Education Budget. [Charts 13 and 14] show the long-term downward trends for BIA education and Office of Indian Education in the Department of Education" (Walke, 1990, p. 4)

Native education systems need a massive infusion of capital so that real decisions can be made about students' education. As in choice programs, if all the options are bad, then you have no choice. If Native communities have no opportunity to direct the education of their children, than there is little reason to expect improvement in student outcomes whatever one's personal feelings might be concerning the desired outcomes. If economic conditions on reservations are not improved by restructuring and expansion of the tax base, there is no reason to expect that any educational restructuring will be successful. The two are inseparably linked.

There is a great discrepancy between what Washington, D.C., office staff say and what is happening in Native communities. Washington staff are not as familiar with life in Native communities as they should be. In order to administer and operate federal programs efficiently and effectively, it is vital that decision makers have a clear view of what the conditions are and how Native people think programs should work.

It is no longer possible to believe that BIA education programs can be improved by trying to "fix" the current system. The BIA education delivery system must be restructured. Tinkering with the system will never bring about the fundamental change that is necessary to ensure that Native students receive the education they deserve. The key element to that fundamental change is local control. Each Native community must have control over education funding or any effort at improvement will be doomed to fail.

The current system of programs causes tribes to see each other as adversaries and to continually seek a diminishing amount of funds. The result is a lack of continuity in the education system. Programs come and go, making it impossible to attract the best teachers, administrators, and support staff because other systems can offer them stability and security. Reliance on programs also forces staff to spend large blocks of what should be instructional time on reports and applications for refunding and new funding (Barsh & Diaz-Knauf, 1984, p. 10). Native schools need a base they can operate with. Native schools should have the right to apply for any program that other schools can, but they also need the base that other schools have. Providing this base will make it possible for schools to have the excellent staff they need for the instructional program.

References

Barbero, C. (1990). Memorandum to Nell Rogers, et al., Request for BIA Education Oversight Hearing. [Fax communication] Washington, D.C..

Barsh, R. L. & Diaz-Knauf, K. (1984). The Structure of Federal Aid for Indian Programs in the Decade of Prosperity, 1970-1980. American Indian Quarterly, Winter, 1-35.

Brescia, W. (1990, January). Philanthropy and the American Indian: Foundation Giving in 1984-1990. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of Native Americans in Philanthropy, Chicago, IL.

Brescia, W. (1990, December 24). [Interview with Nell Rogers, Tribal Planner, Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians]. Choctaw Reservation, Mississippi.

Brescia, W. (1991). [Interview with Spencer, G. & Schagu, K., Washington, D.C. staff for Impact Aid]. Bloomington,IN.

Brescia, W. (1991). [Interview with Hayes A. Lewis, Superintendent of Schools, Zuni Public School District, Zuni, New Mexico]. Bloomington, IN.

Brescia, W. (1991, February 25). [Interview with Velma Mason, Office of Indian Education, Washington, D.C.]. Bloomington, IN.

Brescia, W. (1991, February 26). [Interview with Donna Clapp, Three Feathers, Norman, OK]. Bloomington, IN.

Brown, J. S. (1989). Toward a New Epistemology for Learning, in Frasson, C. and Gauthiar, J. (eds.), Intelligent Tutoring Systems at the Crossroad of AI and Education. NJ: Norwood.

Cavazos, L. F. (1989). Annual Evaluation Report: Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation. Washington, D.C.. U.S. Department of Education.

Costo, R. & Henry J. (1977). Indian Treaties: Two Centuries of Dishonor. San Francisco: The Indian Historian Press.

Cheek, J. (1990). NACIE Scholarship Field Guide. U. S. Department of Education. Washington, D. C.

Deloria, V. (n.d.). Legislative Analysis of the Federal Role in Indian Education. Manuscript in the hand of the author.

Duffy, T. & Knuth, R. (1989, July). Hypermedia and Instruction: Where Is the Match? Paper presented at the NATO Conference, Designing Hypertext for Learning, Tubingen, West Germany.

Fischbacher, T. (1967). A Study of the Role of the Federal Government in the Education of the American Indian. Doctoral Dissertation from Arizona State University.

Fries, J. E. (1987). The American Indian in Higher Education 1975--76 to 1984--85. Center for Education Statistics, U. S. Department of Education. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Garfinkle, R. (February, 19, 1991). [Interview with Sarah Newcombe, National Literacy Program, U. S. Department of Education]. Washington, D.C.

Garfinkle, R. (February, 20, 1991). [Interview with Raymond Towey, Adult Education and Literacy Division, U. S. Department of Education]. Washington, D.C.

Garfinkle, R. (February, 21, 1991). [Interview with Joyce Fawlkes Campbell, Adult education and literacy Division, U.S. Department of Education]. Washington, D.C.

Garfinkle, R. (February, 22, 1991). [Interview with Ronald Pugsley, Adult Education and Literacy Division, U. S. Department of Education]. Washington, D.C.

Gregory, T. B. & Smith, G. R. (1987). High Schools as Communities: the small school reconsidered. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Haddad, W. D. (1990). World Declaration on Education for All. Jomtien, Thailand: New York: UNDP, UNESCO, UNICEF, WORLD BANK.

Indian Nations at Risk Task Force, Initial Meeting, May 14-16, 1990, Cavazos, L. F., Washington, D.C.

Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, Third Business Meeting, October 17, 1990, Hill, N. S., San Diego, CA.

McDonald, J. & Le Beau, E. (1983) Salish Kootenai College. Profile, 1976-1982. Pablo, MT: Salish Kootenai College & University of Montana. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 248 082).

National Advisory Council of Indian Education. (1990). Educating the American Indian/Alaska Native Family: 16th Annual Report to the United States Congress Fiscal year 1989. NACIE, Washington, D.C..

Olivas, M. A. (1982). The Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978: The Failure of Federal Indian Higher Education Policy. Houston, TX: University of Texas. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED227973).

Picus, L. (1990). Research Agenda: OERI Center on Education Finance and Productivity [Bitnet message]. (Copy of this correspondence available from the author upon request.)

Price, M. E. & Clinton, R. N. (1983). Law and the American Indian: Readings, Notes and Cases. Charlottesville, VA: Michie Co.

Report to Senate Interior Appropriations Committee. (n.d.). P.L. 95-561. Washington, D.C..

Schutt, D. (1990). Testimony to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs-Education and Indian Nations at Risk Task Force Regional Hearing. St. Paul: Marty Indian School.

Strickland, R. (ed.). (1982). Felix S. Cohen's Handbook of Federal Indian Law. Charlottesville, VA: Michie Co.

Walke, R. (1990). Trends in Indian-Related Federal Spending, FY1975-1991. Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

About the Author

William Brescia, Jr. received his M.S. in Curriculum and Instruction from the University of Wisconsin at Madison in 1973. He has spent much of his professional life designing and producing educational materials for and about American Indians. He has written and edited numerous books; written, produced and directed video; written scholarly articles; served on national advisory panels; designed and programmed computer education environments; and consulted in curriculum design for grades K-12, higher education and adult education.

After working in the field of curriculum development for the United Indians of All Tribes Foundation in Seattle, Washington, and later as director of Research and Curriculum Development for the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians in Philadelphia, Mississippi, he is now the development officer for Research, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana where his work focuses on American Indian Studies and Museum collections.

Mr. Brescia is also a doctoral student in Instructional Systems Technology and Philanthropy at Indiana University. He plans to use his expertise in instructional systems to improve instruction in philanthropy. His professional goals are to assist American Indian tribes in their efforts to aggressively seek funding from foundations, corporations and individuals, and to train Natives to be successful fund raisers.